

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 9, 2003 has been received and reviewed by the applicant. Claims 1-12 are in the application. Claims 1-12 stand rejected. Claim 11 is canceled. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10, 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gowda et al. (6,344,877) in view of Merrill (5,614,744). The entirety of the rejection is not repeated herein for brevity. However, the most pertinent portion to this rejection states for claims 1 and 12 that "Merrill discloses a capacitor C1 (fig. 3) connected in parallel with the charge voltage conversion d2."

In response, it is pointed out that Merrill does not, in fact, disclose this. First, it is pointed out that, in column 3, lines 42-44, it states that "FIG. 3 circuit shows capacitor C1 and diode d2 to *emulate* the parasitic bit line capacitance." (emphasis added) This clearly discloses that this is not an actual circuit or hardware devices but only a schematic representation the impedance of the "BIT LINE." It is respectfully suggested that this does not teach or suggest "a capacitor connected in parallel with the charge to voltage conversion region wherein the capacitor is designed to have a low voltage coefficient " as in the claimed invention.

Secondly, assuming arguendo that d2 and C1 of Merrill was a physical device, it is *not* connected to the charge to voltage conversion region. The charge to voltage conversion region of Merrill is the upper node of the photocurrent PD and diode d1 (viewing Fig. 3 of Merrill in landscape view), not the node to which d2 and C1 are connected. Therefore, Merrill does not teach or suggest "a capacitor connected in parallel with the charge to voltage conversion region wherein the capacitor is designed to have a low voltage coefficient."

It is noted that the claimed invention includes the advantage of a better linear response and larger charge capacity.

Therefore, claims 1 and 12 substantially include the above limitations and both are patentable for the above reasons.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gowda et al. (6,344,877). This claim is now canceled.

Should the Examiner consider that additional amendments are necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the favor is requested of a telephone call to the undersigned counsel for the purpose of discussing such amendments.

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36,390

Peyton C. Watkins Iam
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-8282
Facsimile: 585-477-4646